



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,324	08/27/2001	Robert T. George	2207/12003	5090

25693 7590 04/13/2004

KENYON & KENYON (SAN JOSE)
333 WEST SAN CARLOS ST.
SUITE 600
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

KIM, HONG CHONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

10

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/940,324

Applicant(s)

GEORGE ET AL.

Examiner

Hong C Kim

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 2/2/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It appears that an integrated cache device was not described in the specification at the time the application was filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Shen et al. (Shen) U.S. Patent 6,526,481 in view of Barroso et al. (Barroso) U.S. Patent 6,668,302.

As to claim 1, Shen discloses a cache-coherent device comprising (Fig. 1): a plurality of client ports (Fig. 1 Refs. 130's), each to be coupled to one of a plurality of port components (Fig. 1 Refs. 110); a plurality of sub-unit caches (Fig. 2 Refs. 134), each coupled to one of said plurality of client ports and assigned to one of said plurality of port components; and a coherency engine (Fig. 2 Refs. 132 & 140) coupled to said plurality of sub-unit caches. However, Shen does not specifically disclose an integrated single cache coherent device.

Barroso discloses an integrated single cache coherent device (col. 21 lines 55-60) for the purpose of increasing speed, decreasing footprint, and decreasing noise level.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an integrated single cache coherent device of Barroso into the invention of Shen for the advantages stated above.

As to claim 2, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said plurality of port components includes processor port components (Fig. 1 Ref. 110).

As to claim 3, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said plurality of port components includes input/output components (Fig. 1 Ref. 110).

As to claim 4, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said plurality of sub-unit caches includes transaction buffers using a coherency logic protocol (Fig. 2 Refs. 132 & 140).

As to claim 6, Shen discloses a cache-processing system comprising (Fig. 1): a processor (Fig. 1 Ref 110); a plurality of port components (Fig. 1 Ref. 110); and a cache-coherent device (Fig. 2 Refs. 132 & 140) coupled to said processor and including a plurality of client ports (Fig. 2 Ref. 130), each coupled to one of said plurality of port components (Fig. 1 Ref. 110), said cache-coherent device further including a plurality of caches (Fig. 2 Ref. 134), each coupled to one of said plurality of client ports and assigned to one of said plurality of port components, and a coherency engine (Fig. 2 Fig. 140) coupled to said plurality of caches. However, Shen does not specifically disclose an integrated single cache coherent device.

Barroso discloses an integrated single cache coherent device (col. 21 lines 55-60) for the purpose of increasing speed, decreasing footprint, and decreasing noise level.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an integrated single cache coherent device of Barroso into the invention of Shen for the advantages stated above.

As to claim 7, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said plurality of port components includes processor port components (Fig. 1 Ref. 110).

As to claim 8, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said plurality of port components includes input/output components (Fig. 1 Ref. Ref. 110).

As to claim 9, Shen discloses the invention as claimed. Shen discloses in a cache-coherent device (Fig. 1) including a coherency engine (Fig. 2 Refs. 132 & 140) and a plurality of client ports (Fig. 1 Refs 130), a method for processing a transaction, comprising: receiving a transaction request (col. 7 lines 13-15) at one of said plurality of client ports, said transaction request includes an address (col. 8 line 49); and determining whether said address is present (col. 8 lines 45+) in one of a plurality of sub-unit caches (Fig. 2 Ref. 134), each of said sub-unit caches assigned to said of a plurality of client ports (Fig. 2 Ref. 110). However, Shen does not specifically disclose an integrated single cache coherent device.

Barroso discloses an integrated single cache coherent device (col. 21 lines 55-60) for the purpose of increasing speed, decreasing footprint, and decreasing noise level.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an integrated single cache coherent device of Barroso into the invention of Shen for the advantages stated above.

As to claim 10, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said transaction request is a read transaction request (col. 7 lines 13-15).

As to claim 11, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses transmitting data for said read transaction request from said one of said plurality of sub-unit caches to one of said plurality of client ports (col. 8 lines 45+).

As to claim 12, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses prefetching one or more cache lines ahead of said read transaction request (cache memory reads on this limitation since the cache memory is used to assure that the currently useful data of main memory are copied into the small and fast cache for the purpose of increasing data access speed by means of spatial and

temporal localities); and updating the coherency state (Col. 9 lines 5-6) information in said plurality of sub-unit caches.

As to claim 14, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Shen further discloses wherein said transaction request is a write transaction request (col. 7 lines 13-15).

4. Claims 5, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (Shen) U.S. Patent 6,526,481 in view of Barroso et al. (Barroso) U.S. Patent 6,668,302 and further in view of Jim Handy, "The Cache Memory Handbook" TK7895.M4H35, 1993, pp 140-240.

As to claims 5 and 13, Shen and Barroso disclose the invention as claimed above. However, neither Shen nor Barroso specifically discloses wherein said coherency logic protocol includes a Modified-Exclusive-Shared-Invalid (MESI) cache coherency protocol.

However, it is well known in the cache art to using MESI cache coherency protocol for the purpose of maintaining data consistency thereby increasing the memory access speed. For example, Handy discloses coherency logic protocol includes a Modified-Exclusive-Shared-Invalid (MESI) cache coherency protocol (Page 159).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add coherency logic protocol includes a Modified-

Exclusive-Shared-Invalid (MESI) cache coherency protocol of Handy into the combined invention of Shen and Barroso for the advantages stated above.

As to claim 15, Shen, Barroso, and Handy disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Handy further discloses modifying coherency state information for a cache line in said one of said plurality of sub-unit caches; updating coherency state information in others of said plurality of sub-unit caches by said coherency engine; and transmitting data for said write transaction request from said one of said plurality of sub-unit caches to memory (MESI protocol reads on this limitation and pages 159-161).

5. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (Shen) U.S. Patent 6,526,481, Barroso et al. (Barroso) U.S. Patent 6,668,302 in view of Jim Handy, "The Cache Memory Handbook" TK7895.M4H35, 1993, pp 140-240 and further in view of Witt et al. (Witt) U.S. Patent 6,202,139.

As to claim 16, Shen further discloses modifying coherency state information of said write transaction request (col. 7 line 13-15); however, neither Shen, Barroso nor Handy specifically discloses write transaction request in the order received and pipelining multiple write requests.

Witt discloses write transaction request in the order received and pipelining multiple write requests (col. 2 lines 42-43) for the purpose of avoiding bank conflicts

thereby decreasing the performance losses and increasing the access speed (col. 2 lines 43-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate write transaction request in the order received and pipelining multiple write requests as shown in Witt into the combined invention of Shen, Barroso and Handy because it would avoid bank conflicts thereby decreasing the performance losses and increasing the access speed.

As to claim 17, Shen, Barroso, Handy and Witt disclose the invention as claimed in the above. Handy further discloses wherein the coherency state information includes a Modified-Exclusive-Shared-Invalid (MESI) cache coherency protocol (Page 159).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument on pages 6-8 that the prior arts do not disclose an integrated cache coherent device has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.

Barroso discloses an integrated cache coherent device (col. 21 lines 55-60) for the purpose of increasing speed, decreasing footprint, and decreasing noise level.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

3. When responding to the office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37 C.F.R. ' 1.111(c).

4. When responding to the office action, Applicants are advised to provide the

examiner with the line numbers and page numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong C Kim whose telephone number is 703-305-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt M Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Hong Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-3835. The Examiner can normally be reached on the weekdays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim, can be reached on (703) 305-3821.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to TC-2100:
(703) 746-7238

HK 
Primary Patent Examiner
April 8, 2004